



REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 29, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims.

All pending claims were rejected as being anticipated by, or obvious in view of, the newly-cited Wei et al. patent (US 5,231,655). It is respectfully submitted, however, that the Wei patent neither anticipates, nor otherwise suggests, the subject matter of the present invention.

As described in the specification, and recited in the claims, the invention is directed to a Soller slit device for collimating high-energy radiation, particularly X-rays. As is well known, a Soller slit comprises a number of parallel blades, or plates, that are spaced apart to provide the passages through which the collimated X-rays pass. In such a device, the path of the X-rays is parallel to the plane of the blades (or substantially parallel within an acceptable divergence angle). See, for example, Figure 1 of the application.

In contrast, the Wei patent is not directed to a Soller slit device. Rather, it employs an entirely different type of structure for collimating X-rays. For example, as illustrated in Figures 4(a) and 4(b) of the patent, the collimator employs a plurality of *stacked* plates. Each of the plates has openings that form passages for the X-rays when the openings on the plates are aligned with one another. In this type of arrangement, the plates are disposed *transverse* to the paths 424 of the X-rays. This type of structure does not constitute a Soller slit, as that term is commonly understood in the art.

To clarify this distinction, therefore, each of claims 1 and 16 now recites that the parallel plates which form the collimating device are spaced apart from one

another to form passages for the transmission of X-rays. As shown in Figures 4(a) and 4(b) of the Wei patent, the parallel plates of its collimator are not spaced apart to form such passages. For at least this reason, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Wei patent does not anticipate, nor otherwise suggest, the subject matter of the claims.

Furthermore, as pointed out in Applicants' previous response, the claims recite that the parallel plates are constructed from glass sheets each having a thickness less than 250 micrometers. With reference to this recitation, the Office Action refers to the Wei patent at column 4, lines 59-62. This portion of the patent discloses that, in one embodiment, the collimator plates can have a thickness less than about 0.25 millimeters. As set forth at the end of the referenced paragraph, this disclosed embodiment pertains to plates which are made of materials such as tungsten, gold and lead. In other words, the collimator is constructed of metal foils.

The passage at column 5, lines 45-51, also identified in the Office Action, describes an alternative embodiment in which the collimator plates can be made from a photosensitive material, such a particular brand of glass. The patent does not disclose that the glass plates of this "alternative" embodiment can have the same thickness as the metal foils of the embodiment described in column 4.


For this additional reason, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Wei patent does not anticipate the subject matter of the claims.

In view of the foregoing, all pending claims are submitted to be patentably distinct from the disclosure of the Wei patent, whether it is considered by itself, or in combination with the Moulton patent. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: December 29, 2005

By: 
James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620